

CFAAR: Who We Are

CFAAR is a nonprofit educational organization which formed originally in 1988 on the University of California-Berkeley campus. The organization was formed in response to activities which were attempting to discredit animal research and animal researchers. Several local CFAAR chapters have since sprung up across the country. These groups share the following objectives:

- 1) *To **organize** students, faculty and staff at institutions in Arizona in which animal research is performed so effective letter writing campaigns can be initiated quickly.*
- 2) *To **educate** the public in general and the campus in particular about the true nature of animal research and animal researchers.*
- 3) *To **support** responsible and humane use of animals in biomedical research.*

The first of these objectives will be the primary function of the group. As legislation is introduced that affects animal research, we need to respond so our representatives know exactly how we, the people, want them to vote. Accordingly, through our newsletter, we will help inform you about legislation and other "happenings" concerning attacks on animal research. Our goal is to make it as easy as possible for you to contact your representatives in Washington D.C. The key to the effectiveness of this organization is you! We need your willingness to write an occasional letter, perhaps talk with a school group and, of course, give a few dollars to cover the cost of printing the newsletter.

If you wish to join the Arizona Chapter of CFAAR and want to continue to receive the

Newsletter, fill out the application for membership on the back page. Please include a voluntary contribution.

Animal-Rights Activism's Dark Side By W. Raymond Wannall

People love animals. So it should come as no surprise that the animal-right's movement, which barely existed a decade ago, is emerging as a formidable force. Animal-rights organizations, fortified by a star-studded list of celebrities - including Doris Day, Bob Barker, Paul McCartney and Liza Minelli - raise tens of millions of dollars a year from the public. Animal-rights leaders' statements and opinions are regularly reported in the media; animal-rights literature is turning up in classrooms around the country.

But there is a sinister side of the crusade for animal rights that has been largely disregarded. A globally active movement that claims compassion for all creatures has shown itself to be paradoxically soft on violence - provided the victims are human beings.

Not only have the animal-rights movement's most prominent leaders refused to clearly and unequivocally renounce the use of violence, they have actually encouraged it by acting as spokesmen and paying legal fees and fines on behalf of militant activists convicted of committing crimes in the name of "animal liberation."

Interestingly, the prime targets of animal-rights extremists are not authentic abusers of animals - but medical researchers. Fanatically opposed to any and all use of animals in biomedical research, the animal-rights movement brands all medical researchers - including scientists and physicians attempting finding cures for AIDS and cancer - white-coated, villainous "vivisectors" who torture laboratory animals for fun and profit.

The fact that every major medical advance of the last century has involved animal research at a critical juncture - the development of the polio vaccine and insulin are two striking examples - is dismissed as "speciesist" propaganda by modern-day animal rightists, who trace their ideological roots to the antivivisectionist movement of Victorian England. In the eyes of the animal-rights movement, animal research is both unnecessary and cruel.

Transcending traditional concepts of animal welfare and humane treatment of animals, to which all decent and civilized people adhere, animal-rights activists assert that every living thing - from rat to a boy - is of equal value. One of the movement's most important leaders, Ingrid Newkirk of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), told Vogue magazine in 1989 that even if animal research resulted in a cure for AIDS, "we would be against it."

A small but significant segment of the animal-rights movement has demonstrated a willingness to go beyond words. For nearly a decade, the shadowy Animal Liberation Front (ALF) has resorted to violence, arson, and intimidation in pursuit of their first priority: abolishing all use of animals in medicine and science.

Year by year, ALF activity has increased and expanded to a point where animal-rights publications now report laboratory raids, sabotage and vandalism by ALF groups in more than a dozen countries. In addition to the United States and Britain, the list of countries to which ALF cells are known to be operating includes Canada, France, the Netherlands, Poland and South Africa.

ALF has claimed responsibility for more than 75 attacks in the United States since 1979, including arson and theft. Most of the targets have been scientific research labs.

The group most often identified as acting as ALF's above-ground spokesman - and the animal-rights group with the most impressive celebrity following - is PETA,

headquartered in Rockville, MD. Although accusations of operational ties between ALF and PETA have not been proved, the connection between the groups seem suspiciously close. Within hours of ALF laboratory raids in Pennsylvania, Texas, Oregon and Maryland, PETA leaders have been ready with news releases denouncing the laboratory conditions, research projects and purposes. PETA-supplied video footage of an ALF break-in recently turned up on the MTV music channel.

The international focus of animal-rights extremists is turning more and more to individual medical researchers, notwithstanding stepped-up violence against hunters, farmers, zoos, wildlife habitats, furriers and butcher shops. As reported by National Public Radio on April 27, ALF founding spokesman Ronnie Lee, who served a jail sentence for conspiracy to plant bombs, justifies the attacks on researchers and their property. "These people are responsible for massive animal suffering," he said, as animal-rightists picketed a research lab, chanting: "Kill, kill, kill the bastards!"

ALF has certainly tried its hand at killing. In June 1990, it took responsibility for the bomb that exploded in England under the car of a veterinary surgeon and forced her through a window of her demolished vehicle. Five days later, a defective bomb fell from the car of a Bristol University researcher. He was unharmed; but a 13-month-old boy was critically injured in the explosion.

Among ALF's most infamous actions in the United States have been the vandalizing of cars and homes of employees of the San Diego Zoo; arson of a furrier in Santa Rosa, CA; raids on labs in Miami, Los Angeles and the Johns Hopkins University Medical School in Baltimore; arson, vandalism and theft caused \$600,000 in damages to the University of Arizona's veterinary lab, and the torching of a new \$3 million veterinary diagnostic center for farm animals at the University of California

at Davis. The FBI described the attack as "terrorism."

The Association of American Medical Colleges has recorded more than 3,700 incidents of harassment by animal-rights activists. In a particularly ugly case, John Orem, a medical researcher at Texas Tech University's Health Science Center, received several death threats, thousands of pieces of hate mail and a condom that a writer claimed had been used by someone infected with the AIDS virus. Orem's crime: conducting painless experiments on cats to better understand Sudden Infant Death Syndrome - SIDS - the leading killer of children under the age of one year.

To date, not one important animal-rights leader has stepped forward to clearly and unequivocally condemn the violent acts. On the contrary, the typical movement response has been either to downplay the violence or to rationalize it as a response to so-called legitimate grievances.

Deafening silence or dubious reasoning - the result is tacit endorsement of violence and extremism that should cause any American, let alone someone in the public eye, to think twice before rallying around the seemingly noble banner of animal rights.

W. Raymond Wannall, a lecturer and intelligence consultant, was assistant director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's domestic intelligence and terrorism divisions from 1973 to 1976

(Chicago Tribune, August 6, 1991)

Oregon Supreme Court Denies PETA Appeal

Refusing to overturn the lower courts' ruling, the Oregon Supreme Court ruled that the People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) lacked standing to bring suit against the University of Oregon. The suit,

originally filed in 1988, challenged the review procedures of the university's Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) in approving a research project involving three barn owls. PETA claimed that the IACUC did not comply with state and federal laws.

In its decision the Supreme Court stated three specific ways an individual or organization may have legal standing to sue: they must show they have been injured because of the government action; they may "seek to further an interest" the Legislature wishes to have considered; or they must have strong enough stake that they would be legally affected by the government decision. The Court further stated PETA "has not shown, or even claimed, that it fits within any of the criteria required by the Legislature for standing. What PETA argues, in essence, is for good government - its own particular view of good government. The Legislative Assembly is the proper forum for balancing political interests."

The five-year project, supported by a grant from the National Institutes of Health, examines how barn owls use sound to visualize space below them. The Marion County Circuit Court and the State Court of Appeals ruled that PETA lacked standing to contest the IACUC's decision.

(NABR Update, Vol XII, No 2, September 25, 1991)

Boston Aquarium Countersues Activist Groups

Officials at the New England Aquarium in Boston have filed a countersuit in U.S. District Court charging three animal rights groups with defaming the aquarium's reputation. The suit, seeking \$5 million in damages, also accuses the activists of filing meritless lawsuits against it, including one last year, in a campaign of harassment.

According to an AP wire story, the countersuit says that the three groups, Progressive Animal Welfare Society (PAWS), Citizens to End Animal Suffering and Exploitation (CEASE) and the Animal Legal Defense Fund (ALDF), distributed fundraising literature filled with false statements about the aquarium and that such materials have caused a drop in public support of the facility. "They have a legitimate right to express their views, but they are releasing statements in their (news) releases that are absolutely untrue" said the aquarium's attorney David Schmahmann. "The aquarium has received letters from members who say they are not coming any more based on the falsehood of statements they've received in literature."

John Prescott, the aquarium's executive director, says this may be the first suit by a zoo or aquarium in the country seeking damages from animal rights groups, and that he expects most of the country's eight major aquariums to file a friend-of-the-court briefs. The aquarium receives about 1.3 million visitors yearly; more than 100,000 school children.

Animals rights groups filed suit against the aquarium last June saying it did not have permits required to transfer a 10-year-old dolphin named Kama to the U.S. Naval Oceans Systems Center in San Diego four years ago. The dolphin was named as a plaintiff. At demonstrations against the aquarium, activist groups distributed fliers claiming that "Kama...was violently removed from his family group and put into captivity." The aquarium noted in its lawsuit that the dolphin was born in captivity at Sea World in San Diego, therefore, no permit is required under federal law. Prescott described the groups as extremist and said that despite meeting with activists for years, the aquarium had decided "you can't reason with them." "We've come to a point where what they are saying is untrue and they are using it to solicit funds." Last year the aquarium abandoned plans to send another dolphin named Rainbow to a Navy facility after activists filed suit. "The

aquarium comprised in the Rainbow case, but while the aquarium can comprise, these groups can't," said Schmahmann. The are unremitting in their ultimate objective."

The activist suit also argues that the aquarium's program to rescue and rehabilitate beached whales, dolphins and seals violates the permit law because the aquarium keeps some of the mammals it saves for research and display. The aquarium says it complies with all federal rules and that no permit is required for saving beached animals. Schmahmann added that if the activists succeed in undermining that program, "mammals will be stranded and will die on beaches. And that is something that the aquarium cannot tolerate."

(NABR Update, Vol XII, No 2, September 25, 1991)

ALF Stages Break-in at Washington State University

The Animal Liberation Front (ALF) struck in the Northwest for the third time in as many months, raiding an animal research facility at Washington State University and "liberating" mink, coyotes, and mice that were being used in research.

Protesting "exploitation of fur animals," the ALF claimed it released seven coyotes, six mink and 10 mice from Washington State University laboratories on August 13. In addition, two offices were searched and equipment destroyed in the raid, causing estimated damages of more than \$100,000.

The ALF took responsibility for the break-in in a facsimile message to the Associated Press in Spokane. "Fur animal research at WSU only serves the economic interests of animal researchers and ranchers who profit from animal exploitation and environmental destruction," the message said. "As a result of the continued exploitation of fur animals by WSU and USDA researchers, the

ALF has been forced to respond in defense of wildlife and wilderness...To abusers of native wildlife everywhere, beware. The ALF has just begun to fight."

Spray painted on one of the walls was graffiti reading "Gilbert is next," an apparent reference to natural resources Professor Frederick Gilbert, who work on beaver and otter traps has been the subject of controversy at the school.

One test measured oxygen consumption of martens and fishers to gauge how much food and land they need in the wild to survive. Gilbert has also tested traps designed to kill fur-bearing animals more humanely.

In recent years, Gilbert killed about 15 beaver testing an underwater trap that was then endorsed by the Canadian government. Last year, Gilbert was the target of hate mail after the university committee refused to let him conduct tests on up to a dozen otters.

On June 10, the ALF set fire to a barn at a mink farm at Oregon State University and destroyed research records in a laboratory office. Five days later, the group set fire to an Edmonds, Washington, food cooperative that supplies food to 150 mink farms. The damage total was estimated at \$500,000 for those incidents.

Washington State University spokesman Al Ruddy told the Associated Press that security at the research facility had been increased following the two June fires. But the animal labs are hard to protect because they are remote, he said.

The research facility receives about \$1.7 million a year. Between \$15,000 and \$20,000 is used for research on about one dozen ferrets and from 250 to 300 mink.

The coyotes at the lab were being used for bone research and for testing sarcocystis, a disease carried by coyotes and often passed on to sheep and causing pneumonia.

TV Station Surrenders Video of ALF Break-in

A Portland, Oregon television station has surrendered a videotape allegedly showing animal rights activists vandalizing and burning the Oregon State University mink research farm (see previous article).

Officials at KATU had refused to surrender the tape of the June 10 break-in and arson, apparently under the belief that Oregon's media shield law protected the station from being forced to reveal sources or materials.

The videotape was surrendered just before a hearing in U.S. District Court, with KATU attorneys citing a federal law that gives federal criminal investigations precedence over state shield laws.

(FBR Newsletter, Vol VIII, No 5, September/October 1991)

Hemoglobin Produced in Pigs

A biotechnology company in New Jersey announced that it has been produced genetically engineered pigs that carry human hemoglobin, the blood component that carries oxygen. The company, DNX of Princeton, will apply next year to the Food and Drug Administration to begin clinical trials to determine if it can be transfused to humans safely.

DNX said it has created three pigs who blood carries up to 15 percent human hemoglobin and hopes to increase that percentage to the point that one pig could produce 20 units of blood substitute per year.

Medical research have been trying to produce such a substitute for about 50 years. The ideal substitute would have a long shelf life, would not require refrigeration and would be unlikely to trigger immunological reactions or to transmit AIDS, hepatitis and other viral diseases. Because pigs cannot contract these

human blood diseases, the substitute blood would be free from contamination or infection.

Although DNX said the hemoglobin should be economically competitive with current blood product, it will be years before the product can be tested adequately and put on the market.

(FBR Newsletter, Vol VIII, No 5, September/October 1991)

Animal Rights Activists: Rich, Liberal Females?

Three recent surveys show the typical animal rights activist to be female, well-educated, affluent and almost certainly white. They also show activists take the liberal position on virtually every controversial issue.

The Associated Press reported that research done by Rebecca T. Richards of California State University, Sacramento, and Richard S. Krannich of Utah State University, had shown that the East and West Coasts are home to many animal rights advocates, while there is a smaller percentage in the South.

The research also showed that 49% of the activists attended college and 33% have postgraduate degrees, compared with 24% and 8% of the U.S. population.

Their data was based on 1,020 surveys mailed to subscribers of *The Animals' Agenda*, an animal rights publication. The research showed that the activists consider themselves pro-environment, anti-war and pro-women's and civil rights. Only 25% favored "conservative" causes such as stopping abortion or promoting prayer in public schools.

A survey conducted by two Oregon State University researchers involved questioning 400 activists who attended a June 1990 rally in Washington, D.C. It reflected a possible bone of contention among animal rights activists: pet ownership. While a large percentage of animal rights supporters

indicated a relationship between their feeling for pets and their involvement in the movement, many leaders strongly oppose pet ownership and regard it as exploitation.

"It's a situation that could cause dissension," said Bill Lunch, Oregon State political science professor.

The OSU survey, conducted by Lunch and Wes Jamison, a doctoral student, found that 71% of those interviewed had no children, while 89% had an average of nearly five pets each.

Lunch, who teaches university courses on the politics of science, said the animal rights movement reflects the antiscience growing among the liberal left society.

"Conservatives often distrust science because it threatens traditional values," Lunch said. "The roots of opposition to science on the left are more difficult to uncover but real nonetheless."

Another survey taken at the same rally appeared in the May 1991 issue of *Psychological Science* and focused narrowly on the attitudes of animal rights activists toward the movement itself. It stated that, "many of the views held by animal rights activists differ sharply from those held by nonactivists."

The responses of 574 self-described "animal rights activists" were compared with 54 others whose survey responses indicated they were not participants in the animal rights movement.

Nearly 80% of the activists valued nonhuman life, compared with 31% from the nonactivist group. 85% of the activists wanted to eliminate all animal research, and more than 60% were in favor of laboratory break-ins. Among nonactivists, only 15% wanted to end animal research, and 14% approved of break-ins.

The survey results suggest even highly committed activists vary greatly in their willingness to use animals for human benefit. 93% did not report valuing nonhuman life above human life, and nearly half felt that the

movement should not focus on animal research as its top priority.

An overwhelming majority of activists held a negative view of scientists who use animals for research. Of those activists expressing an opinion, 87% agreed that the typical animal researcher "doesn't care about laboratory animals" and views animals as "expendable supplies."

The survey concluded that among activists there was a surprising diversity of opinion, from the top priority of animal rights movement to how philosophy of animal rights affected their lifestyles. The commitment of many seems to be qualified: a majority of activists (53%) reported eating meat, poultry or seafood, buying leather products, or both.

(FBR Newsletter, Vol VIII, No 5, September/October 1991)

Scientists Recreate Effect of Alzheimer's in Rodents

Scientists report that a study with rats has duplicated the effect of Alzheimer's disease in human brain cells and may lead to the first effective treatment. Researchers hope the findings are the first step to understanding and curing the disease, which afflicts four million Americans, 1 to 12 over the age of 65, and 1 in 4 over the age of 80.

The study focused on a protein called beta amyloid, which is found in small deposits in the brains of people with the disease. Investigators injected beta amyloid into the hippocampus of living rats. This area of the brain, which controls memory and reasoning, is what degenerates in people with Alzheimer's.

The scientists found that the protein killed rat brain cells, and that two other proteins associated with Alzheimer's began to accumulate in the rats brains.

Researchers then injected another protein called "substance P," which seemed to

block beta amyloid's toxic effects. Not only did substance P work, it could be injected into the bloodstream rather than directly into the brain.

"It is very exciting work, Zaven Khachaturian, associate director of the National Institute on Aging, told the *Washington Post*. "This gives us a way to approach treatment. It means there might be some naturally occurring substance that could actually prevent Alzheimer's.

Khachaturian said researchers will try to reproduce the results in monkeys, whose brains more closely resemble those of humans. He also said that the institute will organize a network of hospitals and clinics to test substance P and other possible Alzheimer's treatments.

Scientists caution that experimental use in humans is several years away, but the study shows that preventing or slowing the progression of Alzheimer's is at least theoretically possible.

"I think it's very early, but it does give us a new therapeutic approach," said Neil Kowall of Massachusetts General Hospital, who completed the studies with Bruce Yankner of Children's Hospital in Boston and other colleagues. "In theory, you could intervene and prevent the horror story of Alzheimer's from happening."

Researchers hope that eventually elderly people could be checked for elevated levels of beta amyloid, which crops up in the skin as well as in the brain. If a test revealed high levels of the protein, doctors could administer substance P or a similar agent to halt or impede beta amyloid's destructive effect on brain cells.

The latest finding supports the theory that beta amyloid is a cause of Alzheimer's rather than an effect of it. Scientists are still unsure how genes, the aging process and possible toxins might combine to produce Alzheimer's.

Past evidence linking the deposits to Alzheimer's disease had come from human brains obtained at autopsy, which frustrated

researchers because they had no way to watch them grow or to measure their impact on behavior. The only other species that develop the plaque deposits are nonhuman primates, which are both rare and expensive to maintain.

Instead, rodents will serve as the models for basic research. In July, it was announced that three research laboratories had produced mice carrying the Alzheimer's gene, which caused them to develop beta amyloid on their own. The models were developed by inserting a human gene into mouse embryos, giving them the ability to develop the plaque deposits.

The oldest genetically altered mice are now about 2 years old, equal to 50 years in human terms. The mouse models will allow researchers to follow the cause and course of Alzheimer's as they age. Scientists will test the mice to see if they lost their ability to learn or suffer from confusion.

"We were at a standstill," Khachaturian said. "It is going to give us an incredibly powerful tool to pursue some questions we couldn't address before."

(FBR Newsletter, Vol VIII, No 5, September/October 1991)

CFAAR ARIZONA MEMBERS:

Have you written to your legislators to support animal research issues? If you don't, who will?

Arizona Congressional Delegation

Senators

The Honorable Dennis DeConcini
328 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-4521

The Honorable John McCain
111 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-2235

Representatives

1st District

The Honorable Jay Rhodes, III
412 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-2635

2nd District

The Honorable Ed Pastor
1520 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-4065

3rd District

The Honorable Bob Stump
211 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-4576

4th District

The Honorable Jon Kyl
313 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-3361

5th District

The Honorable Jim Kolbe
410 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-2542

Have you seen a cartoon or article on animal research that would be good to have in the CFAAR NEWS? Why not submit it today? Just send it to CFAAR NEWS, University of Arizona, Building 101, Tucson, AZ 85721. Do it today!

**Coalition For Animals & Animal Research
Donation Form and Membership Application**

Name: _____

Mailing Address: (Campus, if available)

Phone: _____

Institutional Affiliation (if any): _____
Faculty () Staff () Student () Other ()

I have enclosed a contribution of \$10 \$20 \$50 Other _____

A subscription to CFAAR News is included with your donation.

Make checks payable to **CFAAR** and return to: **CFAAR, University of Arizona, Bldg 101, Tucson, AZ, 85721**

We are in the process of applying for tax-exempt status.

**CFAAR ARIZONA
University of Arizona
Building 101**

Tucson, AZ 85721

146000